



Meeting Notes

Process and Procedures Focus Group Meeting

10:00 a.m. – Monday, June 1, 2009

APS Conference Room, 101 West Cherry Ave, Flagstaff, AZ

1. Welcome and Introductions

In attendance:

Celia Barotz, Citizen
Tish Bogan-Ozman, Real Estate
Georgia Duncan, Citizen
Roger Eastman, City of Flagstaff
Karen Goodwin, Citizen
Neil Gullickson, City of Flagstaff
Kent Hotsenpiller, Engineer
Kara Kelty, Citizen
Vince Knaggs, City of Flagstaff
Ed Larsen, City of Flagstaff
Judy Louks, Real Estate
Paul Moore, Architect
David Monihan, Engineer
Mark Sawyers, City of Flagstaff
Kim Tittlebaugh, Real Estate
Mary Jo Tsitouris, City of Flagstaff
David Walker, NABA

2. Recap Focus Group purpose

The Focus Group will be outcome focused with a strong emphasis on general issues rather than getting into the details of technical code review and a primary goal to ensure that the code implements the Regional Plan.

3. Discussion regarding processes and procedures and related issues associated with the rewrite of the Land Development Code

Roger introduced a new template to track and/or categorize main issues (attached).

Major and minor amendments are defined by state law, which is based on the Growing Smarter legislation.

Flow charts need to be user friendly enough as to aid the layman. Possible "trial run" using the front counter staff.

Write the Code aimed towards the professional, but insert footnotes in the Code or create a users guide for the layman.

Define the purpose for each section of the Code (editorial note).

There is a need for processes and procedures that allow for better communication between staff, the Planning & Zoning Commission, and Council. Need to explore what does and what doesn't belong in the Code.

Allow for processes and procedures in the Code that allow for consistency, certainty, and predictability, regardless of who is doing the interpreting (i.e. staff turnover).

Becoming too consistent and predictable may diminish the ability to be flexible and create "cookie cutter" designs.

Currently fees and time lines are not a part of the Code (separate document).

Economics of Flagstaff can drive developers away. Possibly allow for flexibility in requirements to save on costs (i.e. landscaping). This would also diminish predictability.

There needs to be a balance between economic needs and the needs of other focus groups.

Predictability in time lines can influence the economic impacts of developers. "Surprises" can cause delays and have a negative effect on the developer's financing.

Provide more detail initially with development applications. Need to explore preliminary meetings and level of submittal requirements. May result in fewer surprises but could be more expensive initially.

"Catch 22." Property owners cannot find buyers because they don't know what can be done with the property and cannot find out what can be done with the property until a proposal is submitted.

Mark sawyers provided a list of Code procedures for discretionary and non-discretionary cases (attached).

It was suggested that the group take an actual case and take it through the process to see how it works.

4. Next meeting: June 15, 2009, at 10:00 am.
5. Adjournment at 11:33 am.

RESOLVED ISSUES	FURTHER DISCUSSION
Code that is easy to use and apply – user friendly to citizens and developers (create a sample user). Test with users.	Major/minor amendments – define; Reg. Plan - process; site plan; plats; thresholds for staff review, (graduated thresholds based on scale) etc.
Flow charts and graphics needed	Clarify discretionary and non-discretionary reviews
Timely accurate and consistently reliable	Concerned Citizens of Flagstaff ideas for public participation
Better defn. of process – reduce redundancy	Better relationships between staff, dev. community and citizens. What does “better” mean?
For each section, define the purpose of that section (or put into separate “users guide”)	What belongs in the code and what does not? Fees, time frames, etc. separate doc?
User – write code for professional user; user guide for lay user	Certainty and predictability for citizens, developers and staff (what is currently unpredictable with the LDC?)
Quality of submittal – determinant of approval time	Method for addn. design options
	Further review/discussion of economic impacts – by whom? Also discussed by other Focus Groups (CAG discussion?)
	Explore preliminary meetings and level of required submittal information for these meetings
	Eco. Impacts - Incl. nat. resources, cost to development, timelines, etc.
	Ensure code implements Reg. Plan. Talk more about purpose and role of Reg. Plan.

[illegible]

Land Development Code Procedures:

Discretionary

Administrative Appeals
Annexations

General Plan Amendments
Conditional Use Permits

Approvals

Rezoning
*Variances
Zoning & Text Amendments

Other processes:

Comprehensive Sign Programs to P&Z
Slope & Forest Mitigation

Non-Discretionary

Building Permits
Building Relocations
Certificate of Occupancy
Conditional Certificate of Occupancy

Minor Land Divisions
Minor Modification – Development

Nonconformities
Sign Permits
Site Plan Review
Subdivision
Temporary Permits

* Quasi judicial